



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,671	09/08/2003	Deborah A. Langer	3217	2146

7590 02/01/2006

THE LUBRIZOL CORPORATION
Patent Administrator
Mail Drop 022B
29400 Lakeland Boulevard
Wickliffe, OH 44092-2298

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

POULOS, SANDRA K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1714	

DATE MAILED: 02/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/657,671	LANGER ET AL.	
	Examiner Sandra K. Poulos	Art Unit 1714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/8/03; 12/10/04</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The reference UK 1,571,652 entitled "IMPROVED FIBRE OPTICS T-COUPLER" has not been considered because it does not appear relevant to the present application which concerns a water-oil emulsion composition.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: Oil-in-water emulsions and a method of producing.

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the legal phraseology "comprising." Examiner suggests replacing with "containing." Also, the phrase "an emulsified greases" is grammatically incorrect because greases is plural. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In page 1, line 4 there is reference to USSN 10/154,276 which has matured into US Patent 6,933,263. In page 14, line 23, USSN 09/761,482 has matured into US Patent 6,419,714.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10-13, 16-19, 20, and 22-24 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1, line 47 of page 34 and line 10 of page 35 defines R differently than it was previously defined above (in line 28 of page 34). For clarity, please use a different symbol than R, such as R³, etc. In lines 3-5, y is defined differently than it was previously defined, please use a different symbol. In the formula for (x), the 2 in R-NH₂ should be a subscript. In (xi) "the combination" should be "a combination."

Claim 2: "comprises" should probably be "comprising."

Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 10-12, 18, 20, 22, and 23 appear to improperly recite a Markush group. When materials recited in a claim are so related as to constitute a proper Markush group, they may be recited in the conventional manner, or alternatively. For example, if "wherein R is a material selected from the group

consisting of A, B, C and D" is a proper limitation, then "wherein R is A, B, C or D" shall also be considered proper (emphasis added). See MPEP § 2173.05(h).

Claim 6 of the current claims, for example, recites a proper Markush group.

Claim 5: There appears to be a misplaced comma after 'water soluble salts' in line 29. The comma in line 4 that appears after 'phosphorous acid' should probably be a semicolon.

Claim 12: There should be a space between ofpolyacrylates (of_polyacrylates) in line 20.

Claim 13: "polymers comprised of" should be "polymers are comprised of" and "terpolyer" should be "terpolymer."

Claim 16: "viscostiy" is misspelled.

Claim 17: It is unclear if the molecular weight is number average or weight average. Applicant has support for number average MW in the specification, page 16.

Claim 18: "lignin, lignin derivative, monoglyceride, monoglyceride derivative" are written twice.

Claim 19: See the objection to claim 1. When re-assigning symbols for structure (viii), please take note of the structure in line 25, which appears to be a modified version of (viii).

Claim 23: It is unclear what is meant by "a desired particle size" when the particle size is then further specified by dimensions. Furthermore "dispersion of water in oil" seems to indicate that oil is in the major amount, which conflicts with

the base claim. Also, it is unclear if the mean particle size is describing the water or the oil.

Claim 24: Pressure is generally given in just "psi" not "/psi" (or 'per psi').

Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 14, 19, 20-24 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,933,263. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following explanation.

US 6,933,263 discloses mixing water, oil, emulsifier, thickeners, oil soluble additives, and optionally water soluble additives and alcohols. The present claims refer to a mixture of water, oil, emulsifier, and optionally thickeners, oil soluble additives, water soluble additives and alcohols. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the thickeners, oil soluble additives, water soluble additives and alcohols as optional because the claims that further define the composition disclose those additives as being optional (i.e. from 0% and up) and thus fall within the scope of the present claims and one of ordinary skill in the art would have arrived at the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 14, 19, 20-24 are directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 1-19 of commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 6,933,263. Specifically, although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct for the reasons set forth in paragraph 6 above.

7. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP § 2302). Commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 6,933,263, discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee can, under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and 37 CFR

Art Unit: 1714

1.78(c), either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made, or name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications pending on or after December 10, 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 is indefinite because in (vii) when n=0, R=H, and R'''=H, structures vii-1 and vii-2 represent the structure for water, which results in the "emulsified composition" comprising only water and oil without any definitive emulsifier.

Regarding claims 1 (ix), 3, and 12 the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

All other claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Preliminary Remarks

9. It is noted that some embodiments in the present claims have support in the parent case, US 6,933,263, and thus are entitled to an effective filing date of May 23, 2002. However, there are other embodiments which were present only in the continuation-in-part application and therefore, those embodiments are entitled to the actual filing date of September 8, 2003. A proper rejection requires application of the Lorant reference as both 102(e) and 102(b) rejections, as set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10, 11, 14, 18-20, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lorant (US 2002/0045670).

Lorant '670 discloses emulsions comprising (A) 10-30% of at least one cosmetic oil, (B) 2 to 10% of at least one non-ionic emulsifier having an HLB

Art Unit: 1714

ranging from 9 to 18, (C) 5-15% of at least one foaming surfactant, and (D) 40-60% water (paragraphs 24-33). The emulsified composition has particle sizes from about 70 to 350 nm (0.07-0.3 µm) (paragraphs 40-42). The oils include natural or synthetic waxes, natural or synthetic oils, and esters of dicarboxylic acids (paragraphs 51-53). The non-ionic emulsifier has an HLB of 9 to 18 (paragraph 55-59) and can be obtained by ethoxylation of fatty acid esters of glycerol (paragraph 57). The dispersant aqueous phase may contain a mixture of water and of polyhydric alcohols (paragraph 83). The emulsion may also contain water soluble additives such as antioxidants (paragraph 84). The agents for the skin, such as agents against free radicals (antioxidants) are employed in the range of 0.01-10%. The process of producing the emulsion appears to be a batch process where the components are added in phases and stirred at normal temperatures and pressures (examples). The oil-in water emulsions are employed for cleaning and care for the skin and are translucent. Since it is used on the skin, the emulsion is coated on the skin and is therefore a translucent coating.

There are no metal deactivators, antifoams, or antirust compounds in the composition disclosed by Lorant '670, therefore, they are present in 0% of the emulsified composition.

Therefore, Lorant '670 anticipates the cited present claims.

11. Claims 1, 2, 4- 6, 8, 10, 11, 14, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lorant (US 2002/0045670).

The discussion with respect to Lorant '670 in paragraph 10 above is incorporated herein by reference.

Lorant '670 discloses an emulsifier with the structure given in paragraphs 58-59 that anticipates the structure given in (vii-1) of the present claims.

Therefore, Lorant '670 anticipates the cited present claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of

Art Unit: 1714

35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lorant '670 as applied to claims 1, 2, 4- 6, 8, 10, 11, 14, 18-20, 21-24 above, and further in view of Stern (US 2,466,647).

The discussion with respect to Lorant '670 in paragraph 10 and 11 above is incorporated herein by reference.

Lorant '670 does not teach the particular kind of antioxidants used.

Stern '647 discloses a lubricating oil composition that contains water and oil emulsions where the water-to-oil ratio is 1:1 to 100:1 (col 5, paragraph 2). Emulsifiers are given in column 4. The oils may contain antioxidants, anticorrosives, etc. Antioxidants are of the phenol or aromatic amine type, such as those named in column 5, lines 64-75.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the antioxidants in Stern '647 as specific examples of the antioxidants one should use in Lorant '670 because both compositions are water-oil emulsions. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lorant '670 with Stern '647 to obtain the invention as specified in the present claims.

13. Claims 12 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lorant '670 as applied to claims 1, 2, 4- 6, 8, 10, 11, 14, 18-20, 21-24 above, and further in view of Koch et al (US 2005/0120619).

The discussion with respect to Lorant '670 in paragraph 10-11 above is incorporated herein by reference.

Lorant '670 does not disclose polyisobutene substituted succinic acid or anhydride.

Koch '619 discloses water-fuel oil emulsions (abstract; paragraphs 29-34). The emulsifiers are described in paragraphs 35-38. Olefin copolymers and terpolymers are disclosed in paragraph 58. The molecular weight of polyisobutylene components are disclosed in paragraph 48. The reaction of maleic anhydride or succinic groups with polyolefins is disclosed in paragraphs 68-69, 75, 86 and 91-92. The composition includes co-surfactants with an HLB of 2 to 10 (paragraph 105). Alcohols may be used in the composition.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use polyisobutene substituted succinic acid in the composition of Lorant '670 because Koch '619 discloses it as a beneficial emulsifying component. One would have a reasonable expectation of success because both compositions are oil-water emulsions.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lorant '670 with Koch '619 to obtain the invention as specified in the present claims.

14. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 12 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lange et al (US 6,020,291) in view of Koch '619.

Lange '291 discloses an aqueous metal working fluid in an oil-in-water emulsion. The ratio of oil to water may vary from 1:5 to 1:200 (col 11, lines 33-

44). Typical emulsifiers include salts derived from the reaction product of carboxylic acylating agents with amines or hydroxylamines (col 11, lines 33-44). The composition includes components such as anti-foam agents, metal deactivators, corrosion inhibitors, antimicrobials, extreme pressure, antiwear, antifriction, and antirust agents (col 11, lines 46-57). Metal deactivators include materials such as triazoles (col 11, lines 46-57). The oils used in the emulsion can be natural or synthetic oils and alkylene oxide polymers (col 10, lines 49-67; col 11, lines 1-32). Lange '291 is silent with respect to detergents (i.e. there is 0%).

Lange '291 does not disclose the specifics of the emulsifiers that are used in the composition.

Koch '619 discloses water-fuel oil emulsions (abstract; paragraphs 29-34). The emulsifiers are described in paragraphs 35-38. Olefin copolymers and terpolymers are disclosed in paragraph 58. The molecular weight of polyisobutylene components are disclosed in paragraph 48. The reaction of maleic anhydride or succinic groups with polyolefins is disclosed in paragraphs 68-69, 75, 86 and 91-92.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the hydrocarbyl substituted acylating agents as the emulsifying agent as disclosed by Koch '619. One would have been motivated to do so because Lange '291 does not provide much information on emulsifiers and so one would need to choose suitable emulsifier and would base his/her decision on what worked well in similar compositions. Koch '619 is a similar oil-water emulsion. The oil in Koch

Art Unit: 1714

'619 is diesel fuel oil, and among the oils disclosed by Lange '291 diesel oil is disclosed, therefore one would have had a reasonable expectation of success with the combination of Lange '291 with Koch '619, and therefore would obtain the invention in the cited present claims.

15. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lange '291 in view of Koch '619 as applied to claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 12 and 15-17 above, and further in view of Filippini et al (US 2004/0111957).

The discussion with respect to Lange '291 in view of Koch '619 in paragraph 14 above is incorporated herein by reference.

Lange '291 in view of Koch '619 does not disclose functionalized polymers comprised of maleic anhydride grafted olefin terpolymer of ethylene/propylene/norbornadiene.

Filippini '957 discloses a maleic anhydride grafted olefin terpolymer of ethylene/propylene/norbornadiene as a viscosity modifier in a water-oil emulsion (paragraph 142; 49-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the viscosity modifier disclosed by Filippini '957 in the composition disclosed by Lange '291 in view of Koch '619. One would have been motivated to do so because the ability to vary the viscosity allows one to use the composition to different situation and thus results in a more versatile composition. One would have a reasonable expectation of success because Filippini '957 discloses a water-oil emulsion wherein the oil is liquid hydrocarbon fuel.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lange '291 and Koch '619 with Filippini '957 to obtain the invention as specified in the present claims.

16. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lorant '670 as applied to claims 1, 2, 4- 6, 8, 10, 11, 14, 18-20, 21-24 above, and further in view of Filippini et al (US 2004/0111957).

The discussion with respect to Lorant '670 in paragraph 10-11 above is incorporated herein by reference.

Lorant '670 does not disclose functionalized polymers comprised of maleic anhydride grafted olefin terpolymer of ethylene/propylene/norbornadiene.

Filippini '957 discloses a maleic anhydride grafted olefin terpolymer of ethylene/propylene/norbornadiene as a viscosity modifier in a water-oil emulsion (paragraph 142; 49-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the viscosity modifier disclosed by Filippini '957 in the composition disclosed by Lorant '670. One would have been motivated to do so because the ability to vary the viscosity allows one to use the composition to different situation and thus results in a more versatile composition. One would have a reasonable expectation of success because Filippini '957 discloses a water-oil emulsion with similar components as Lorant '670.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lorant '670 with Filippini '957 to obtain the invention as specified in the present claims.

17. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lange '291 in view of Koch '619 as applied to claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 12 and 15-17 above, and further in view of Karol (5,026,865).

The discussion with respect to Lange '291 in view of Koch '619 in paragraph 14 above is incorporated herein by reference.

Lange '291 in view of Koch '619 does not disclose lithium 12-hydroxystearate and the composition with a viscosity greater than 200 cPs.

Karol '865 discloses lithium 12-hydroxystearate in oil-water compositions (example 20; claim 4). The additive had an excellent performance under extreme pressure conditions.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use lithium 12-hydroxystearate in an oil-water emulsion because it gives improved properties to the final composition.

The composition disclosed by Lange '291 and Koch '619 in view of Karol '865 would be the same as that disclosed by applicant, therefore the composition was intrinsically meet the viscosity requirement disclosed in current claim 3.

Therefore, the combination of Lange '291 and Koch '619 in view of Karol '865 results in the invention disclosed in the presently cited claims.

Conclusion

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sandra K. Poulos whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 1714

(571) 272-6428. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-4:30, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SKP
Sandra K. Poulos

1/27/06

Vasu Jagannathan
VASU JAGANNATHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700